



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/960,612	09/20/2001	Christen M. Anderson	660088.446	5657

500 7590 07/02/2002

SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 6300
SEATTLE, WA 98104-7092

EXAMINER

HUI, SAN MING R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1617

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/960,612

Applicant(s)

ANDERSON ET AL.

Examiner

San-ming Hui

Art Unit

1617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-26 and 35-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 27-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election without traverse of the invention of Group I, claims 1-11, 22-40 in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged.

Claims 12-21 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 6.

Applicant's election of the specie of Cpd. No.1 in page 43 of the instant specification in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claims 22-26, 35-40 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected specie, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in Paper No. 6.

The claims have been examined herein to the extent they read on the elected invention and species.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for Cpd. No. 1, does not reasonably provide

Art Unit: 1617

enablement for other mitochondrial Na⁺/Ca²⁺ exchanger antiporters. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant specification fails to provide information that would allow the skilled artisan to practice the instant invention without undue experimentation. Attention is directed to *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (CAFC 1988) at 1404 where the court set forth the eight factors to consider when assessing if a disclosure would have required undue experimentation. Citing *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546 (BdApls 1986) at 547 the court recited eight factors:

- 1) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- 2) the amount of direction or guidance provided,
- 3) the presence of absence of working examples,
- 4) the nature of the invention,
- 5) the state of the prior art,
- 6) the relative skill of those in the art
- 7) the predictability of the art, and
- 8) the breadth of the claims.

Applicant fails to set forth the criteria that defines "mitochondrial Na⁺/Ca²⁺ exchanger antiporters". Additionally, Applicant fails to provide information allowing the skilled artisan to ascertain these compounds without undue experimentation. In the instant case, only a limited number of "mitochondrial Na⁺/Ca²⁺ exchanger antiporters" examples are set forth, thereby failing to provide sufficient working examples. It is

Art Unit: 1617

noted that these examples are neither exhaustive, nor define the class of compounds required. The pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, requiring each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. The instant claims read on all "mitochondrial Na⁺/Ca²⁺ exchanger antiporter(s)", necessitating an exhaustive search for the embodiments suitable to practice the claimed invention. Applicants fail to provide information sufficient to practice the claimed invention, absent undue experimentation.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The expression "a subject having or suspected of being at risk for having diabetes mellitus" in claim 1 renders the claims indefinite as to the subject being treated herein.

The expression "agent that ... mitochondrial calcium/sodium antiport activity" in claim 1 renders the claims indefinite as to the active compounds encompassed by the claims herein.

The expression "maturity onset diabetes of the young" in claim 6 renders the claim indefinite as to the age of the diabetic onset encompassed thereby.

Claim 9 recites the limitation "the candidate agent" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-11 and 27-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy et al. (J. Clin. Invest., 1996; 98(11):2524-2538 from IDS received January 4, 2002) and Cox and Matlib (Trends Pharmacol. Sci., 1993; 21(4):595-599 from IDS received January 4, 2002).

Kennedy et al. teaches insulin secretion as dependent upon cellular glucose levels and resultant elevation of cytosolic and intramitochondrial Ca^{2+} (See particularly the abstract). Kennedy et al. also teaches carbachol acts synergistically with glucose to increase both cytosolic and intramitochondrial Ca^{2+} and thereby increasing the secretion of insulin (See particularly page 2533, col. 2, last paragraph to page 2535, first). The skilled artisan would see the increase of insulin level in response to elevated glucose level as a treatment of diabetes.

Cox and Matlib teaches that the elected compound, CGP-37157, is a potent mitochondrial $\text{Na}^{+}/\text{Ca}^{2+}$ exchanger antagonist which would be expected to increase the intramitochondrial Ca^{2+} concentration (See page 10, Table 1 and page 409, col. 1, last paragraph).

The references do not expressly teach employing CGP-37157 orally in diabetes therapy.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to administer the elected compound, CGP-37157, to treat diabetes.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to administer the elected compound, CGP-37157, to treat diabetes. Based on the teachings of Kennedy, one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably expect compounds, such as CGP-37157, increasing the intramitochondrial Ca^{2+} level in response to elevated glucose level to provide increased insulin and thereby treating diabetes. The skilled of artisan would possess all conventional administration method of the active compounds such as oral administration. The selection of one or another route of administration would be seen as a simple selection from among obvious alternatives.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to San-ming Hui whose telephone number is (703) 305-1002. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon 9:00 to 1:00, Tu - Fri from 9:00 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minna Moezie, J.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4612. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4556 for regular communications and (703) 308-4556 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/960,612

Page 7

Art Unit: 1617

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

San-ming Hui
July 1, 2002


RUSSELL TRAVERS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1200